

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed September 20, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1-2 for certain informalities. In response, claims 1-12 have been amended for non-statutory reasons to remove the informalities the Examiner's, as well as for better form including beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A', and deleting reference numerals typically used in European practice that are known to not limit the scope of the claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 5, 12 and 17 is respectfully requested. Claims 1-12 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,603,291

(Wheeler). Further, claims 8-9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Wheeler in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,247,212 (Vinal). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-12 are patentable over Wheeler and Vinal for at least the following reasons.

Wheeler is directed to an integrated driver circuit that includes a low side component and a synchronous DC voltage converter circuit. A timing circuit 150 controls a driver circuit 32 which is isolated from the timing circuit 150, for example by a level shift circuit 136.

It is respectfully submitted that Wheeler does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

a decoder connected to the at least one switch, wherein the at least one driver circuit and the at least one switch are disposed on a common integrated circuit, and wherein the decoder is connected to a signal ground which is different from a power ground of the common integrated circuit.

A decoder connected to a signal ground which is different from a power ground of the common integrated circuit is nowhere taught


or suggested Wheeler. Vinal is cited to allegedly show other features and does not remedy the deficiencies in Wheeler.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-12 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claim 1.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
December 18, 2007

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101